

p25

App. F. IX-4

1931-32

File No. 234-30

Previous References

G.O. No. 4802/252 of 11.8.1890

(2)

Serial Nos. 1-5.

Later References

Aug 234-30 - 11 (18)

12

166-36-1-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

307-48-1-12

Serial Nos. 5.

Part B for May 1932

SUBJECT.

Re. Taking over of the management of
the Sri Lakshminarayana Swami Temple
at Hampapur Yed. Hse. Dy. by Govt. on
account of the unsatisfactory management

Sanctions the proposal of the M. C.

No. 1661-63/ Aug 234-30-5
of 13.5.32

The Mysore Comm.

Compl. to Govt

Supd. Rev. Survey & Settlement

247

Serial
No.

X. No. 1986/26-7 of 30.12.30
 from the Muzrai Commissioner
 stating that Sri. Lakshminarayana-
 Swami Temple Stampaper
 Yedatole Taluk is not being
 properly managed by Mr.
 Venkatachala Sengupta and
 requesting under the circumstances
 stated therein sanction to take
 over the properties of the temple
 under Government Management.

(1) Whether
 the assets will all be realisable
 now and why there was delay
 in getting the properties (lands
 and bonds) transferred to the name
 of the deity are points for consideration.

H. Secy)

17.1.31

(3) Has the management been
 found?

UP The L.D.O. states that "it is known
 that the institution is not being
 managed properly by Mr. Venkatachala Sengupta."
 This conflicts with para 5 of
 the D.O. letter of 8th Dec 1925.
 Is the statement made at A^m in
 the D.O. letter of 28th March 1930 sufficient
 for govt. to intervene and take over
 management?

Serial
No.

Petition of 24/1/31 addressed to the Third
Member on Council from Mr. Venkataswami
Srinivasan Secretary, Sri Lakshminarasimha
Swami Temple at Hampapur
Gedoor, Idukki requesting that he
may be given an opportunity to
represent the case before final
orders are passed about the
management of the temple.

Minutes of the meeting of Council
on P. U. D.

& References
Filed into the Dep. File.

In the reply to para 3, it is stated
there is nothing in the records to show
that there is mismanagement
of the temple. ~~It is also stated~~
As seen from records great stress is laid
upon the fact that Mr. Venkataswami
Srinivasan has failed to produce
the loan bonds for inspection in spite
of repeated notices. Excepting this,
there is no other irregularity in the
management. It is added Mr. Venkataswami
Srinivasan will be asked to produce
the loan bonds ^{and accounts} for perusal here.

As for para. Kind ref. is
invited to para 11 page 31 of the petition.

May File No. 234

47 11751

of 1930.

General and Revenue
Secretary

Matter forming an enclosure to the P. U. S.
Govt. Can take away the management of the
temple to their control if there are
irregularities in the management
as per views of the local experts by the donor.

Flag. C.

The statement made in the Dy. Commr's
letter of 30. 3. 30 (see the marked portion A.)
does not ^{seem} enough to deprive the existing
Manager of the management of
the institution without giving
him an opportunity to explain how
far he has satisfactorily discharged
the trust

N.

5996.

29/11

Fl (ccy)

VS
29.1.3

I was connected with the management of this
institution for some years after the death of M^r. Annajiengar,
my father-in-law, who ^{had} maintained it in an efficient con-
-dition. The temple has excellent landed properties, and
there is little difficulty in having them to advantage and realising
the produce.

I regret that the present manager M^r. H. Venkateswara
Suryan has not satisfied the Muzung officers that the
properties are kept intact, that the financial interests of
the temple are being safeguarded and that the temple
services are being regularly performed.

As pointed out in the notes, there is not sufficient
material on record to show that there has been such
mismanagement as to justify drastic action at once.

In view of the representation made by the Member

1051

App. F. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat

File No. _____ of 193

Serial
No.

OFFICE OF THE
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL
30 JAN. 1931
4292

6095
31/1

only fair that M^r. Venkatesh Ingam should be given
a further opportunity to give his bonafides and to
explain in detail how he has been managing the prop-
-ties of the institution ⁱⁿ its best interests.

I understand that the gentleman has ~~also~~ interviewed
the M.C. also and ~~refers~~ promised to produce before him
all the records and ~~titles~~ connected with the case.

I think the application presented here may be referred
to the M.C. who may be requested to give ^{M^r. V. Ingam} and then offer
-him the opportunity to present his case and to submit a further
report in the matter of taking over the management
of the institution by him.

3rd meeting

29-1-31.
1/5

(K) I agree
31/1/31

(H) 5/1/31. sub accordingly
H Secy
31/1/31
31.1.31

(K) Issue
2/2/31.

20 An endorsement to the part may be proposed
for order
7/2/31.

5/

1051

File No. 224

of 1932

General and Revenue
Secretariat

No 1715 of 3-2-31 to the Mysore
Commissioner forwarding petition in
original received from Mr Venkataswami
Deputy Secretary - Late Shrinagar
Munis temple at Hampapur
with instructions referred to the
Dft letter dated called for in para 20.
- referred for orders
H.S. 7/2
Fl. Secy) 7/2 9.2.31

2


211) not-recd
2
9/2

Letter No. C 1479/24 - 25 of 3-5-32
- from the Mysore Commissioner
stating that ~~the~~ ^{the action} of Mr Venkataswami
Deputy, Karyadarsi of Sri Lakshmi-
Naraswami temple at Hampapur
70 above Taluk as detailed
therein ~~is~~ unconstitutional and
unauthorised and proposing
that the management of the
Institution in question together
with its endowments be taken
over by Government.

Sus
10-2-31.

8200
615

25 Subd to the ref. to para 15-46.
Supra-
9.5 5/5
26 8/6/32
Fm: Secy) The M. is recommendation may be
approved - He may be requested to take any
further action, as proposed, very early.
1st meeting



28. Mrs
7/5/32
6/5/32
7/5/32
7/5

6

7

App. F. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat

21/3

File No.

284

of 1930.

Serial
No.

29. Subd. into a draft

Keeto


9/5/32

For Secy)

For perusal
before issue.

9/5/32

h
10/5/32 *h*
11/5



5

Go no 1661-63 of 13.5.32
Sanctioning the recommendation
of the Mysore Commission referred
to therein.

B
6075

NOTE—Contn Sheet

File No.	of 193	General and Revenue Secretariat

No. 1986 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

26.7.1931

Dated Bangalore, 23rd December 1930.

30

From

S. B. Rajagopalachari, Esq., B.A., M.L.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

BANGALORE.

To

The Secretary to the Government of is

Embassy the Maharaja of Mysore.

Financial Department.

Sir,

Management, Sri Lakshminarayanaswami temple, Hampapur-
Tadatore Taluk.



Copy 234 + 30-1

In forwarding herewith the notice file of vernacular --
records received with the Mysore Deputy Commissioner's letter --
No. 11/11-C. dated 30th March 1930, (copy enclosed) on the above
subject, I have the honor to state as follows:-

The temple in question is a Muzrai institution endowed
with a cash grant of Rs. 11-10-0 a year. One Mr. Sreenivasa
Iyengar in a deed of gift dated 14th August 1930, set apart certain
lands and cash belonging to him as endowments to the temple and --
requested Government to accept the endowments and give him the sole
management of the temple with power to appoint and dismiss temple
servants. Government in Pro. O. 4302/252 dated 11th August 1930
agreed that the produce and produce etc., paid to the temple will
be appropriated and distributed in accordance with the wishes of
Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar, but that his request to grant powers of
appointment and dismissal of temple servants cannot be allowed.
The donor Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar died in the year 1931, and
after him one Annaji Iyengar (his brother's son) succeeded to
management of the institution. Mr. Annaji Iyengar was
Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar's present and only son, and was
in charge of the institution for a period of four years. After
the death of the deceased Annaji Iyengar (Venkatesh
Iyengar) assumed charge of the management. The said

388

present under his management. Complaints of mismanagement of the institution and its properties having been received, Government in Madras Secretary's letter No. 1943/1uz.403-14-6 dated 5th --- 12th 1917 directed the institution of formal proceedings under sections 3 and 9 of the Madras Regulation to secure better management of the affairs of the temple. An enquiry was accordingly set on foot and after a prolonged investigation the Deputy Commissioner on 24th June 1925 submitted the records stating that worship was conducted regularly in the temple and the premises were not clean. A further report was called for from the --- Deputy Commissioner in this office, letter dated 11th August -- 1925 observing that the Amildar's report to the effect that --- worship was conducted properly in the temple was not supported by facts and the Deputy Commissioner was requested to submit -- proposals for fixing a scale of income and expenditure and the appointment of Dhamadarsis to the institution in consultation with Mr. Venkatachala Iyengar. From the report of the Deputy Commissioner dated 31st December 1925, it is seen that out of the accumulated savings of Rs. 14,511-6-5 at the credit of the institution at the end of December 1924, a sum of Rs. 2900/- had been spent by Mr. Venkatachala Iyengar for the purchase of fresh lands and a sum of Rs. 4,230-3-0 ^{as} lent to private individuals and the balance of Rs. 581-3-5 remained with the manager. It was further reported that all the transactions were made in the name of --- Venkatachala Iyengar and that the Sub Division Officer had been requested to get them all transferred in the name of the temple before the end of January 1926. On an enquiry from this office whether the bonds and sale deeds were transferred to the name of the temple, the Deputy Commissioner reports that Mr. Venkatachala Iyengar failed to appear before the Sub Division Officer and was evading service of notice sent to him, that he had failed to produce the bonds for loans lent to private individuals out of the realizations of the land and that it is doubtful if he was able to execute any bond for the amounts lent by him. The particulars of the transactions purchased are also not known. The Deputy Commissioner states that the institution is not being managed ---

managed properly by Mr. Venkatachala Iyengar and recommends that as the temple is a Mazraa institution and as the Donor ----- Mr. Sreenivasa Iyengar has stated in his deed of gift that in -- case of mismanagement of the properties endowed by him Government may step in and take over the management, the management of the temple properties may be taken over by the Government. I may add that opportunity was given to Mr. Venkatachala Iyengar to present his case in this office and that he was not availed ---- himself of the same. As there is clear evidence of mismanagement of the properties on the part of Venkatachala Iyengar, I request that sanction of Government may kindly be obtained to take over } the properties of the temple under Government management. On receipt of sanction of Government, the Deputy Commissioner will be instructed to take action for the recovery of the amounts lent out and for getting the share of the lands purchased transferred to the name of the Mazraa and to submit proposals for fixing a scale of income and expenditure and appointing a committee of Shradhdars to the temple. A copy of Mysore Deputy Commissioner's letter - No.C.636/17-18 dated 3th December 1925 is also enclosed for ---- reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Y. Narasimha Rao
for Mazraa Commissioner.

als

Letter No.H.11/A.C. dated 30th March 1936 from the Deputy
Commissioner, Mysore District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Management, Sri Lakshminarayanawamy temple, Hampapur,
Medatore Taluk.

With reference to your letter No.C.1479 of 24-25 dated 9/12-
2-26 regarding the management of the affairs of the Sri Lakshmi-
narayanawamy temple at Hampapur, Medatore Taluk, I have the honor
to state that the Sub Division Officer, Mysore reports that ---
Mr. Venkatachala Iyengar who is managing the lands of the temple
has failed to appear before him by evading service of notice sent
to him, that he has failed to produce the bonds for moneys lent
A to private individuals out of the realisations of the lands and
that it is doubtful to say if he has got executed any bond for the
amount lent by him. He adds that it is learnt that the institu-
tion is not being managed properly by Mr. Venkatachala Iyengar and
recommends that the management of the temple and the lands may be
taken over by Government and that the Amildar authorised to take
action to the recovery of the amounts lent out.

2. As the temple is a Muzrai Institution and as the donor Mr.
Prinivasa Iyengar has stated in his deed of gift that in case of
mis-management of the properties endowed by him, Government may
step in and take over the management, I request that sanction of
Government may kindly be obtained to the proposal of the Sub --
Division Officer, Mysore.

3. The entire record on the subject is submitted for reference.

"C o p y"

Y. Narasimha Rao
Deputy Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.C.636/17-18 dated 5/8th December 1930 from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

With reference to your letter No.C.1479/24-25 dated the 10/11th August 1925, calling for submission of certain further information regarding the management of the affairs of the Sri Lakshminarayanawami temple at Annapur, Yadatore Taluk, I have the honor to state that the Sub Division Officer, Mysore, who was requested to enquire into the matter, reports that Venkatachalla Iyengar, the present manager of the temple has furnished accounts showing the income and expenditure of the temple up to the end of December 1924 and also a brief history of the temple which is enclosed in the file.

2. With reference to the information required in Muzrai Secretary's letter No.2026/Muz.403-14-22 dated the 20th March 1915, it is reported that the particulars of endowment, and its income and expenditure have been detailed in the copy of the document executed by the donor which is enclosed in the file. The donor died during the year 1896-97 () issueless and after him the management of the institution went into the hands of his brother's son Annaji Iyengar. After the demise of Annaji Iyengar, the management of the temple is being looked after by his adopted son Venkatachalla Iyengar since 1905.

3. The accumulated savings at the credit of the institution to the end of December 1924 as detailed by Venkatachalla Iyengar is Rs.14,511-6-5; out of this, a sum of Rs.2,900/- has been utilised for the purchase of fresh lands, a sum of Rs.4,230-5-0 has been lent to private individuals as loan and the balance of Rs.7,381-5-5 is shown to be kept by Venkatachalla Iyengar for meeting necessary current expenditure. As the sale deeds of lands purchased and the bonds executed by the borrowers for the money lent are in the name of --- Venkatachalla Iyengar, the Sub Division Officer, Mysore, has been requested to get them all transferred in the name of the temple --- before the end of January 1926 and report the fact.

4. The Sub Division Officer, Mysore, after personal inspection of the temple on 6-9-1925, has stated that it has been kept very well and that there were no complaints against the management of the

temple by Venkatchalla Iyengar.

5. As regards the appointment of ~~xx~~ fresh Dharmadarsis, the present manager has said that there is no necessity as the donor has laid ~~own~~ instructions in this behalf. The Sub Division Officer states "~~xxxx~~" it is point whether in the interests of the institution and its preservation of the fairly large endowments which are capable of being added to, Dharmadarsis may not be appointed by Government, he adds however that Venkatchalla Iyengar has made donations himself and others may not do so." I do not consider the appointment of Dharmadarsis necessary at present. Mr. Venkatchalla Iyengar may be required to maintain the accounts and submit the returns prescribed in the Muzrai Manual.

6. As a report on the above points has been called for, I have ~~xx~~ submitted the same with connected records for favour of final decision.

C o p y -"

Yenarasa Raja Ray
for Muzrai Commissioner.

ch

and Revenue Secret *

23
05
MUZ

all
A visitor desiring to see any officer is requested to send up his name, stating the nature of his business.

22/8. May
Name

H Venkatachalaiah

h
22.1.31 Whom he wishes to see

19 *Three members*

Business

In connection with

Sri Laxminarayana

*Swamy Temple case of
Hampapur, Hyderabad }*

14

1718 - Enc 1 and one file ^{3rd}
2nd February 31.
May 234-30-2


The

Financialxxxxxxx

The Muzrai Commissioner,
Bangalore.

With reference to your letter No. 1986 of 1926-27 dated 30th December 1930 regarding the affairs of the Sri Lakshminarayanaswami temple, Hampapur, Yedatore Taluk, I am directed to forward herewith in original an application dated 22nd January 1931 presented by Mr. Venkatachalaiah and to request you to be so good as to give another opportunity to the gentleman to represent his case, recommended. The records are returned herewith for reference and retravision with your further report on the subject.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,


For Financial Secretary to Government
G.S.

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat .

()

the

193

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section

Mu3

File No.

234-30

Serial No.

2

No.

1715- Same one &
one file.

To

Me.

To,

With respect to your

Sd/- A. N. Raghavachar
 Letter no. 1986/26-27 of
 30/12/30 regarding the
 affairs of the Sri Lakshmi
 Narayana Swamikal Temple
 Hampapur Y. datore Tal.
 I am directed to forward
 herewith in original
 an application of 27/1/31
 presented by the Venkataswami
 Temple to the District
 and to request you

[over]

16

16
be so good to give
in ^{other} opportunity to me ~~also~~

~~Intention~~ gentleman to 'uproot his cane -

~~have his bonds at \$50~~

Explain in detail how

He has been managing

~~The Institution before drastic~~
~~recommended~~

~~Action is taken on the M.C.C.~~

The records are returned

herewith for ref^{ce} & retransmission.

Wrote you for the report on the Salween.

~~As regards the~~ Name etc

31.1314 ~~See~~ ^{h. 211/n} ~~to~~ ^{to} ~~gone~~

21 sept

S-S MBL

21/1/21

No. C. 1479 / 24.25


OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER

IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 14th April 1931.

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.



To

Rajaseva Parayana

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore,

..... F. i. n. a. n. c. i. a. l. Department.

Sir,

with reference to your D.O.No.2128 dated 30th March 1931 ---
requesting the submission of a further report on the affairs of Sri --
Lakshminarayanaswami temple at Hampapur, Yedatore Taluk, after giving an
opportunity to karyadarsi Mr. Venkatachalaiengar, to represent his case
in respect of his management of the institution in question, I have the
honor to state that Mr. Venkatachalaiengar was here last month with the
account books maintained by him to record the transactions relating to the
affairs of the institution. On going through these books certain dis-
crepancies were found and the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District has
been requested to furnish particulars in respect of them.

As the information called for has not been received till now, he
has been reminded to submit the same early and on its receipt, a detailed
report will be submitted to Government.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

S. P. Rajagopalachari

Muzrai Commissioner. —

1931

Subd for perusal with the accounts file
17/4/31 H. Secy)


17.4.31

30/4/31

M. O. 131

No. C 1479/24-25
2. Four to a ver file


OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.



Muz 234-30-4 Dated, Bangalore, 27th April 1932.
3rd May

FROM

S. HIRIANNAIYA, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.



TO

Rajasevaparayana
P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore

Finance and Revenue Department.

XX
Immediate
h 4/5/32
SIR,

M. 18.
45 PM.
5/5/32
16
43 PM

In continuation of this office letter No. C.1479/24-25 dated 3-4-31 intimating that Mr. Venkatachella Iyengar Karvadarasi of Sri Lakshminaraswami temple at Hampapur, Vedalore taluk, appeared before me with accounts and that as there were certain discrepancies therein further information had been called for from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, and letter C.1479/24-25 dated 30-12-30 requesting sanction of Government to take over the properties of the temple under Government management owing to mismanagement of the same by the Karvadarasi, I have the honor to state that the accounts were audited by the Auditor of this office.

The present Karvadarasi assumed management of the temple with its endowment from Rajasevaparayana Mr. B. Srinivasa Iyengar in 1905 and has been managing since then. A classified abstract of transactions compiled yearwise from the Cash Book maintained by him up to end of 31-12-30 is forwarded herewith for information together with a comparative statement of lands.

(b) During the period of his management he has borrowed from the funds of the institution a sum of Rs. 4500/- on his own responsibility and has not furnished any security. However for the first time he has admitted in writing (vide his written statement forwarded herewith in original) that he has borrowed money and could execute necessary documents. According to the accounts he has credited to the

be

temple funds a sum of F 604/- on account of interest at 6% on borrowed. An additional sum of F 356/- is due from him on account arrears of interest. A statement showing loan transactions in question is enclosed herein for information. The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, has been requested this day to arrange for proper security being taken to secure the loan. The above action of the Karyadarsi is unconstitutional and unauthorized and necessitates the immediate assumption of the management by the Government.

(c) According to the Settlement Deed a printed booklet of which is in the accompanying vernacular file the quantity of gutta paddy was 117½ candies out of which after reserving 50 candies for distribution to temple servants etc., the balance of 67½ candies had to be sold for cash and the sale proceeds utilised for payment of Kandavam and Mitavasthi expenses. Since the Karyadarsi has not maintained accounts relating to collection and disposal of paddy and has not been taking gutta ^{or} ~~has~~ from tenants cultivating temple lands, the actual quantity of paddy collected and the quantity sold could not be arrived at. However according to the Cash Book entries it was found that during the 25 years under consideration the average quantity of paddy sold per year works out to 62 and odd kandas. The yearly average quantity of paddy sold falls short of the quantity shown as available for sale in the Settlement Deed. The utilisation of temple funds by the Karyadarsi for his personal use and the non-maintenance of paddy accounts have given room in the past for complaint of mismanagement against him. To regulate the affairs of the institution it is necessary to arrange for the cultivation of temple lands through Government Agency and the maintenance of proper accounts in the Taluk Office Mysore Branch. ^A regular bill of income and expenditure should also be sanctioned.

(d) The donor, the late Mr. Minivasa Iyer in the Settlement Deed had appointed a Committee of 60 persons to supervise the management of the institution either by himself or others to be appointed by him, investing it with powers to assume management of the affairs of the ~~management~~ institution and not managed as per terms set forth in the Settlement Deed and also stated that if the Committee found it impossible to manage the affairs according to its wishes the Government may step in and assume management. The Committee appointed by the donor does not appear to have worked at all with the result that the Karyadarsi's actions are unchecked. In these circum-

3.

Circumstances it has become necessary to appoint a Committee of Dharmadarsis under Rule 6 of the Rules under the Muzrai Regulation VII of 1927 to control effectively the affairs of the institution.

(e) In G.O. No.4802/252 dated 11-3-30 copy of which is enclosed herewith for ready reference accepting the endowment made by the late Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar Government have ordered that as the temple is a Muzrai institution under the management of Government Officers it must continue to remain under the same management so long as the tasulk is paid by Government and that the immoveable properties bequeathed by Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar may be managed in accordance with any Rules or instructions of the donor but the puduvat and produce etc., paid to the temple will be appropriated and distributed in accordance with the wishes of the said Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar. The directions contained in the above order have not been given effect to.

2. In the above circumstances I am of opinion that the management of the institution in question together with its endowments should be taken over by Government, a proper scale of income and expenditure being fixed and a Committee of Dharmadarsis appointed. On receipt of Government orders I shall issue instructions to the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, in the matter.

3. The file of vernacular records ending with French Rocks Sub Division Officer's No.H.11 AG. dated 23-3-31 is forwarded herewith for reference and return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Srinivasan
Muzrai Commissioner.

K. S.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Read:-

Docket No. 758 and 82 dated 30-12-1889 and 29th April 1890 from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, forwarding for approval the printed rules framed for the management of the temple of Takshminarayana at Hampapur, Madatore Taluk, and soliciting sanction for the submission of the accounts of the temple to the Taluk Officer and supervision and inspection of the institution by Government authorities.

Order thereon No. 4302/252 dated, Bangalore 11th August 1890.

The temple is endowed with a tasdik allowance of Rs 11-10-0 per annum from Government. The Muzrai return submitted to this office by the Deputy Commissioner show that the temple is one of the muzrai institutions under the management of Government officers. Therefore it must continue to remain under the same management so long as the tasdik is paid by Government.

2) The immoveable properties bequeathed by Srinivasa Iyengar be managed in accordance with any Rules or Instructions of the donor but the Puduval and produce etc., paid to the temple will be appropriated and distributed in accordance with the wishes of the said Srinivasa Iyengar.

3) In para 6 of the printed rules the power of appointment and dismissal of the temple servants is sought to be given to Srinivasa Iyengar and other persons appointed by him as Managers. This cannot be allowed.

Sd/- F. Ananda Rau,
CHIEF SECRETARY.

"COPY"

Ramkrishna

For Muzrai Commissioner.

[Signature]

22

Statement of loan account of Mr. B. Venkatachalla Lingar
Karyadarsi of Sri Lakshmi Narayanaswamy temple at
Hampapur Yedatore Taluk.

Date of loan.	Amount.	Total interest due upto 31-12-31 at 6%	Recovery of interest. Date. amt.		Balance of interest due.	Remarks.
31-12-25	2000	*720/-	3-12-27	120-0-0		For 6 years
10-2-26	1700	600/10/8	1-12-28	222-0-0		For 5 years 10 & 30 days.
30-12-28	300	54-0-0	13-12-29	30-0-0		For 5 years.
13-12-29	500	61-6-0	31-12-30	10-0-0		For 5 years & 10 days.
31-12-30	400	24-0-0	1-1-30	222-0-0		for one year.
Total.	4900	1460-0-8		604-0-0	856-3-8	

NOTE:- Loan to carry 6% interest.


 For District Commissioner.



Proceedings of the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read:--

Correspondence ending with letter No. J. 1679/1/-25, dated 3rd May 1932, from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, reporting on the unsatisfactory management by the karyadarsi Mr. H. Venkateshela Iyengar of the Sri Lakshminarayanaswami temple at Hampapur, Yedatore Taluk (a Muzrai Institution) to which one Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar endowed through a settlement deed dated 14th August 1888 certain landed property and cash and recommending as per terms of the settlement deed and in the circumstances stated that the management of the institution in question together with its endowments may be taken over by Government, that a proper scale of income and expenditure ^{be} fixed and that a Committee of Dharmadarsis be appointed to supervise its affairs.

Order No. 1661-63/ May 234-60-1/- 51

Bangalore, dated the 11th May 1932.

The recommendation of the Muzrai Commissioner is sanctioned. He is requested to take necessary further action in the matter very early.



For Financial Secretary to Government

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore retaining records.
The Comptroller to Government.
The Superintendent, Revenue Survey and Settlements in Mysore

Diary No. of letter replied to

Section *Eng.*

File No. 234-30

Serial No. 5

General and Revenue Secretariat

()

the 193 .

Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Serial 1/1/1

Date of issue 13-5-1932

Read—

Correspondence ending with

Signed by *Mr. B. Venkataswami*Letter No. C-1479/24-25 & 3rd May 1932from the M.C. stating that the Sri
Lakshminarayanaswami temple atHampapur, Gedare Taluk (is a
Muzrai Institution) to which one M.Sreenivasaiah was ^{endowed through a settlement} deed of 14.8.1888Order thereon.—No. ^{certain landed property & cash} ~~set apart certain land & cash belonging~~

to him as endowments, that the present

Karyadasi of the temple M. Venkataswami

is not managing the properties

of the temple properly by keeping

proper accounts, that certain of his

loan transactions in respect of the

temple funds ^{which} are unconstitutional &

May this be—

(i) printed ?

(ii) treated as a standing order ?

(iii) published in the Gazette,
English Part ?

(iv) translated ?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press ?

(vi) published in the Gazette,
Kannada Part ?reporting on the
unsatisfactory
management by

the Karyadasi

M. H. Venkataswami

of

1/1/1

that the

circumstances noted

management of the institution
in question together with its endow-
ments may be taken over by Govt. that
a proper scale of income & expenditure
being fixed & a Committee of
Dhamadars appointed to manage it.

The affairs of

Order: No. 1661-53/10-32

The ~~proposed~~ ^{recurrence} of the inc. ~~is approved~~ is sanctioned.
He is requested to take necessary
further action in the matter
Very truly,

[Signature]

h
10/5/32
9/9/32 Pkz Sfr

List of Enclosure

7

The Rec returning records
n Compt. Mr. Govt.
" Supdt. - New Survey & Settlement.

Copied by

Examined by